REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

I. Amendments to the Claims

Independent claims 1, 20, 24, 25, 27 and 29 and claims 2-6, 15-19, 21-23 and 30 that depend therefrom have been amended to clarify features of the invention recited therein and to further distinguish the present invention from the references relied upon in the rejections discussed below.

II. Objections

Claim 2 was object to for reciting "measurement instruments further a clock device," which was identified as being unclear. Claim 2 has been amended to recite "measurement instruments further including a clock device." As a result, the phrase identified by the Examiner has been clarified and withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph Rejection

Claims 1-7, 9-25, 27, 29 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph for failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, claims 1-7, 9-25, 27, 29 and 30 were rejected for reciting "using contour lines on a map, a geographical distribution of epidemic degrees of the infection" which is a limitation that the Examiner could not locate in the specification.

In view of the above-mentioned rejection, independent claims 1, 20, 24, 25, 27 and 29 and dependent claims 2, 19 and 30 have been amended to (i) remove the limitation "using contour lines on a map, a geographical distribution of epidemic degrees of the infection," and (ii) recite "geographical distribution of average values of the plurality of vital data stored in the database, the geographical distribution representing the average values using shading such that the shading becomes darker as the average values increase and such that the shading becomes lighter as the average values decrease." Support for the above-mentioned new limitations can be found, at least, on page 15, line 27 to page 16, line 24 of the specification.

As a result, it is respectfully submitted that pending claims 1-7, 9-25, 27, 29 and 30 now recite subject matter that is described in the specification. Therefore, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph Rejection

Claims 1-7, 9-25, 27, 29 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Specifically, the above-mentioned claims were rejected for reciting "using contour lines on a map, a geographical distribution of epidemic degrees of the infection," which was identified as being unclear.

As mentioned above in section III, the rejected claims have been amended to replace the phrase "using contour lines on a map, a geographical distribution of epidemic degrees of the infection" with a phrase that is clearly described in the specification and that distinctly claims and clearly describes the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention.

As a result, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-7, 9-25, 27, 29 and 30 now recite

subject matter that distinctly claims and clearly describes the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention. Therefore, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

V. 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) Rejection in View of Blants et al. (U.S. 6,231,519)

Claims 1-7, 11, 19-25, 27, 29 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Blants. This rejection is believed clearly inapplicable to claims 1-7, 11, 19-25, 27, 29 and 30 for the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 1 recites a system including a server, a receiving apparatus, and a plurality of measurement instruments. Further, claim 1 recites that the server includes a value-added information making device that processes each of a plurality of vital data stored in a database, the processing being based on at least one of (i) measurement position information and (ii) residence information, which are associated with each of the plurality of vital data stored in the database, and that makes, from the plurality of vital data, value-added information indicating a geographical distribution of average values of the plurality of vital data stored in the database, the geographical distribution representing the average values using shading such that the shading becomes darker as the average values increase and the shading becomes lighter as the average values decrease. In addition, claim 1 recites that the receiver includes an output device that receives the value-added information provided by the value-added information providing device, and that presents and outputs the geographical distribution of the average values of the plurality of vital data. Blants fails to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned distinguishing features as recited in independent claim 1.

Rather, Blants merely teaches creating ACT specific risk maps for cities, as well as larger or smaller areas (see col. 5, lines 29-35). Specifically, Blants merely teaches creating risk maps, but does not describe how the risk maps are created and how the risk maps are represented.

Thus, in view of the above, it is clear that Blants merely teaches creating a risk map, but fails to disclose or suggest making value-added information indicating a geographical distribution of average values of the plurality of vital data stored in the database, the geographical distribution representing the average values using shading such that the shading becomes darker as the average values increase and the shading becomes lighter as the average values decrease, and presenting and outputting the geographical distribution of the average values of the plurality of vital data, wherein the presented geographical distribution represents the average values using shading such that the shading becomes darker as the average values increase and the shading becomes lighter as the average values decrease, as required by claim 1.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that independent claim 1 and claims 2-7 and 9-19 that depend therefrom are not anticipated by Blants.

Amended independent claims 20, 24, 25, 27 and 29 are directed to a server apparatus, a method of using a system, a method of using a server, a program and a receiving apparatus, respectively and each recite features that correspond to the above-mentioned distinguishing features of independent claim 1. Thus, for the same reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 20-25, 27, 29 and 30 are allowable over Blants.

Applicants also note that the present invention, as recited in claim 1, requires a structure that provides a unique and remarkable effect of allowing users of the value-added information to

visually and instantaneously understand the geographical distribution which represents the average values of the vital data serving as indicators of an infection using shading such that the shading becomes progressively darker as the average values increase and the shading becomes lighter as the average values decrease. This unique and remarkable effect does not result from the invention of Blant.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Blants or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Blants to obtain the invention of independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 20, 24, 25, 27 and 29 and claims 2-7, 9-19, 21-23 and 30 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

VI. 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) Rejection in View of Iwano (U.S. 2003/0014283)

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9, 15, 20, 22 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Iwano et al. (U.S. 2003/0014283). This rejection is believed clearly inapplicable to claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9, 15, 20, 22 and 29 for the following reasons.

The distinguishing features of amended independent claim 1 are discussed above in section V.

Iwano merely teaches that vital data transferred to a server is statistically processed and stored in a storage device (see paragraphs [0053]-[0059]).

Thus, in view of the above, it is clear that Iwano also fails to disclose or suggest making value-added information indicating a geographical distribution of average values of the plurality of vital data stored in the database, the geographical distribution representing the average values

using shading such that the shading becomes darker as the average values increase and the shading becomes lighter as the average values decrease, and presenting and outputting the geographical distribution of the average values of the plurality of vital data, wherein the presented geographical distribution represents the average values using shading such that the shading becomes darker as the average values increase and the shading becomes lighter as the average values decrease, as required by claim 1

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that independent claim 1 and claims 2-7 and 9-19 that depend therefrom are not anticipated by Iwano.

Amended independent claims 20, 24, 25, 27 and 29 are directed to a server apparatus, a method of using a system, a method of using a server, a program and a receiving apparatus, respectively and each recite features that correspond to the above-mentioned distinguishing features of independent claim 1. Thus, for the same reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 20-25, 27, 29 and 30 are allowable over Iwano.

Applicants also note that the present invention, as recited in claim 1, requires a structure that provides a unique and remarkable effect of allowing users of the value-added information to visually and instantaneously understand the geographical distribution which represents the average values of the vital data serving as indicators of an infection using shading such that the shading becomes progressively darker as the average values increase and the shading becomes lighter as the average values decrease. This unique and remarkable effect does not result from the invention of Iwano.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Iwano or elsewhere in the prior art of

record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Iwano to obtain the invention of independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 20, 24, 25, 27 and 29 and claims 2-7, 9-19, 21-23 and 30 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

VII. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection of Claims 9-14 and 16-18

Claims 9-14 and 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of Iwano, Ito et al. (U.S. 6,572,564), and Reed et al. (U.S. 6,524,239).

As discussed above, Blants and Iwano do not disclose or suggest the invention recited in independent claim 1. Claims 9-14 and 16-18 depend on claim 1. Therefore, Blants and Iwano also do not disclose or suggest the invention recited in claims 9-14 and 16-18. Thus, at least, due to their dependence on claim 1, claims 9-14 and 16-18 would not have been obvious in view of Iwano, Ito and Reed.

VIII. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Tatsurou KAWAMURA et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/
2009.03.20 15:01:16 -04'00'

By:_____

Andrew L. Dunlap
Registration No. 60,554
Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
March 20, 2009